

10-14-05

AF # ZW



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Philemon L. BRUNER, *et al.*

Application Serial. No. 09/497,284

Filed: February 2, 2000

For: **APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR
REJECTING JAMMED COINS**

Art Unit: 3653

Examiner: SHAPIRO, Jeffrey A.

Atty. Dkt. No: 10356.0035.NPUS00

(BRUE:035)

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.192

BOX AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is an appeal of the Examiner's Final rejection of pending Claims 1-23 and 27-34. Appellant hereby appeals from the Final Rejection of November 16, 2004. Submitted herewith are three copies of Appellants' Appeal Brief together with the requisite fee.

(1) Real Party in Interest

Imonex Services, Inc. is the real party in interest in the captioned application.

(2) Related Appeals and Interference

There are no related appeals or interference known to Appellants that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The application contains pending Claims 1-23 and 27-34.

10/17/2005 HLE333 00000126 083038 09497284

01 FC:2402 250.00 DA

10/17/2005 HLE333 00000126 083038 09497284
02 FC:2254 795.00 DA

Claims 24-26 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement.

Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are on appeal.

Claims 1-7, 13-18 and 27-28 are subject to final rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Appellants note that although the Examiner did not specifically identify Claims 32 and 34 in the final rejection, these claims are listed in the Examiner's argument and Appellants believe the Examiner intended to include Claims 32 and 34 in the rejection under § 102(b) and will treat them in this brief as included in the rejection.

Claims 8-12, 19-23, 29-31 and 33 are subject to final rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are subject to final rejection based on obviousness-type double patenting.

(4) Status of Amendments

No amendments were filed subsequent to the final rejection.

(5) Summary of the Invention

Sensors for detecting good and bad coins are known in the art. However, even in coin acceptor/rejectors that employ sensors, the problem of coins jammed in a coin race requires the use of a mechanical coin return button. A coin acceptor/rejector apparatus that eliminates the mechanical coin return provides advantages over the prior art, including allowing the positioning of a coin rejector in an area where a mechanical coin return is impractical. Moreover, a rejector that can serve the same function to monitor and detect good coins from bad coins, including jammed coins, simplifies the coin acceptor and rejector function, thereby increasing the utility and reliability of the coin acceptor and rejector.

In the claimed invention, the separator and rejector body is composed of at least two segments. These two segments are hinged together so that the separator and rejector body can be opened by pivoting the two segments apart about the hinge. These segments when put together in the closed position form a coin race between the two segments

wherein the coin race has a first wall and a second wall. (See, e.g., Application, Page 5, Lines 18-21 and Figs. 2 and 3). The two segments are hinged together so that the two segments can be pivoted apart so as to open the rejector body, and thereby open at least a portion of the coin race formed between the two halves of the rejector body. Once the rejector body is pivoted into its open position, a coin within the coin race can fall from the rejector and acceptor body. (See, e.g., Application, Page 8, Lines 6-10). To make the rejection of false or jammed coins fully automatic, an actuator is programmed to open and close the rejector body, and thereby the coin race itself, upon the detection of coins in the race by using one or more sensors in electrical communication with an actuator such that upon detection of a coin by the sensor, the actuator will pivot the race wall from the closed position to the open position, thus permitting the coins to fall from the separator and rejector body and into a coin return. (See, e.g., Application, Page 7, Lines 27-30).

(6) Issues

- (a) Whether Claims 1-7, 13-18, 27-28, 32 and 34 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Chung (U.S. Patent 5,788,047).
- (b) Whether Claims 8-11 and 19-22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chung in view of Neathway et al (U.S. Patent 6,227,343 B1).
- (c) Whether Claims 12, 23, 29 and 30 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Mercurio (U.S. Patent 5,007,519).
- (d) Whether Claims 31 and 33 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Fougere (U.S. Patent 3,792,766).
- (e) Whether Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-22 of Bruner (U.S. Patent 5,988,349) in view of Chung.
- (f) Whether Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-25 of Bruner (U.S. Patent 6,155,399) in view of Chung.

(g) Whether Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of Bruner (U.S. Patent 5,647,470) in view of Chung.

(h) Whether Claims 1-23 and 27-34 are provisionally unpatentable under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over the claims of copending Application No. 09,339,011 in view of Chung.

(7) Grouping of Claims

For the rejection based on anticipation, Claims 1-7, 13-18, 27-28, 32 and 34 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness rejection based on Chung and Neathway, Claims 8-11 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness rejection based on Chung and Mercurio, Claims 12, 23, 31 and 32 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness rejection based on Chung and Fougere, Claims 31 and 32 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on Claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent 5,988,349 in view of Chung, Claims 1-23 and 27-34 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on Claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent 6,155,399 in view of Chung, Claims 1-23 and 27-34 stand or fall together.

For the obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on Claims 1 of U.S. Patent 5,647,470 in view of Chung, Claims 1-23 and 27-34 stand or fall together.

For the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on the claims pending in U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/339,011 in view of Chung, Claims 1-23 and 27-34 stand or fall together.

(8) Argument

Anticipation

(a) Chung (U.S. Patent 5,788,047) Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-7, 13-18, and 27-28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Chung does not address the problem of jammed coins as described in the presently claimed invention. Anticipation requires that the claimed invention to be known in the prior art “in the detail of the claim” such that each element and limitation contained in the claim is present in a single prior art reference “arranged as in the claim.” *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveleand Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 U.S.P.Q.2d 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The Chung reference fails to me this requirement.

The device disclosed by Chung focuses on the deficiency of prior art “stopper boards” that act as a “gate” inserted through the race wall and across the path of the coin race. The stopper board is connected to a magnetic valve switch (91) and a magnetic valve arm (911). The board is retracted by actuation of the magnetic valve switch, thereby allowing a good coin to pass. Bad coins are blocked by the stopper board (Chung, Figures 2 and 3). Chung notes that these stopper boards often fail to completely retract, causing a true coin to be guided to the coin return passage to drop into the coin exit. Chung, Col. 1, Lines 10-35. Chung also notes that when coins enter into the coin receiving passage, the coin is stopped by an additional stopper board until a signal is received to open the board. Chung notes the problem of multiple coins being inserted into the coin receiving passage that can jam the coin receiving passage.

Chung discloses a device that consists of two portions: (1) a coin sorting device 100, and (2) a sequential coin receiving device 200. Chung, Col. 2, lines 56-57. The present invention is directed to coin sorting.

With respect to the coin sorting device, Chung addresses the problem of stopper boards by disclosing “a coin collecting machine including a coin sorting mechanism *pivottally disposed in a coin way* for adjustably biasing a shifting member so as to change exit of the coin way, whereby the true coin and false coin are accurately dropped out from different exits into a coin receiving passage and a coin returning passage respectively.” Chung, Col. 1, Lines 54-62 (Emphasis Added). In the presently claimed invention, there is nothing “pivottally disposed in the coin way” as described in Chung. Rather, the presently claimed invention addresses a different issue in a different way, eliminating

many of the moving parts disclosed by Chung and improving the efficiency of the coin sorting process.

More specifically, Chung describes a device having three "base boards" put together to form a coin way. The second base board is "resiliently pivotally disposed on the first base board 1...." The "third base board 3 [is] fixedly disposed on the first base board 1." The three base boards together "define a coin way 10 therebetween." As described in Chung, a coin that enters into the coin race 101 of coin way 10 slides along coin way 10 and through the oscillators 20. (Chung, Col. 4, lines 10-14.) Chung's oscillators are serially connected to form a high or low frequency oscillating circuit 20a. (Chung, Col. 3, lines 45-46.) This serves as a coin detecting device for analyzing the thickness, material and diameter of a coin 5 passing through the coin way 10, which provides data to a central processing unit in order to ascertain whether the coin is a "true or false one." (Chung, Col. 3, lines 47-50.) If the coin is good, a signal is generated to trigger driving member 42, which rotates a pushing lever 421. (Chung, Col. 4, lines 15-16.) The front edge 410 of shifting member 41 is driven to abut against the first lateral wall 10a of the coin way 10. (Chung, Col. 4, lines 16-18.) The coin then slides outward along a first face 41a of the shifting member 41 and drops into a coin receiving passage 61 of the coin receiving device 200. (Chung, Col. 4, lines 18 – 22.)

Chung describes the sequential coin receiving device 200 as disposed under the coin sorting device 100, referring to Figs. 9 and 10. (Col. 4, lines 36-38.) Referring to Figs. 4, 10, 11 and 12, Chung describes the operation when multiple coins are inserted into the coin collecting machine, through the coin detecting device and into the coin receiving device. When coins enter the passage 61, and a signal has not been generated to the controlling magnet valve 82, a stopper arm 813 of the first end of the coin receiving member 81 is driven by a valve stem 821 to extend and stay in the coin receiving passage 61 for stopping the coins from dropping down further. (Chung, Col. 5, lines 39-47). The controlling magnetic valve 82 is described as having a sliding valve stem 821 that disposed therein. A spring 822 is compressed between the valve stem and the main body of the magnetic valve 82. If the magnetic valve 82 is not energized, the spring 822 pushes the valve stem 821 to drive the stopper arm 813 "of the first end of the coin

receiving member 81 to extend into the coin receiving passage 61. (Chung, Col. 5, lines 25-33.) When a signal is transmitted by the coin receiving device 200 to energize the magnetic valve 82, the valve stem 821 is “magnetically attracted and retracted to drive the abutting member 814 to extend into the coin receiving passage 61 and retain the secondary coin 5 therein.” (Chung, Col. 5, lines 33-38.)

The Examiner’s anticipation rejection identifies Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 27, 28, 32 and 34 as describing a coin separator and rejector body as disclosed in Chung. (16 November 2004 Office Action, Pages 2-3 (hereinafter “Office Action”).) The Examiner identifies Chung’s based boards 1 and 2 as being hinged together in pivotal connection, said hinged segments defining one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed between said hinged segments. (Office Action, Page 2.) The Examiner’s anticipation argument further identifies the driving member 42 and controlling magnetic valve 82 as described in Chung as equivalent to the “actuator” of the present invention and being “in mechanical connection with said pivotal portion of said race wall.” (Office Action, Page 3.) This is incorrect.

In Chung, the driving member 42 and controlling magnetic valve 82 are not in mechanical connection with the pivotally connected base boards 1 and 2. Rather, a “coin removing lever 14 [is] connected with the second base board 2 for operatively outward biasing the second base board 2 and enlarging the distance between the first and second base boards 1, 2 so as to remove any deformed coin 5 jammed in the coin way 10.” In operation, a user must depress the coin removing lever 14 to remove jammed coins from the race. (See, e.g., Chung, Col. 6, lines 15-43.) Coin detection and processor programming plays no part in the biasing apart of base boards 1 and 2 in Chung. Chung fails to disclose the limitations of Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 27, 28, 32 and 34 as arranged in the Claims. Accordingly, Chung fails to anticipate these Claims.

With respect to anticipation of Claims 2 and 28, the Examiner’s Final Rejection identifies a second sensor of Chung (20) located in a downstream portion of the rejector body. (Office Action, Page 3.) The Office Action references Chung, Figure 5 showing three sensors (oscillators as described at Chung, Col. 3, lines 43-45) located along the

raceway at certain locations. The Office Action concludes that these locations can be construed as upstream and downstream portions. However, the disclosure of Chung as referenced in the Office Action fails to anticipate Claim 2 and 28 of the present invention. The central processing unit generates a signal for biasing the shifting member 41 so as to change the outgoing direction of the coin way 10. (Chung, Col. 3, lines 51-54.) The shifting member 41 is not related to the “resiliently pivotally disposed” first and second base boards (Chung, Col. 2, lines 66-67; Col. 3, line 1).

With respect to the final rejection of Claims 3-6 and 14-17 for anticipation, the Office Action again references Chung’s driving member 42 and controlling magnetic valve 82. The Office Action concludes that the claimed solenoid and/or electric motor serve the same function, using the same structure in substantially the same way as in the present invention. (Office Action, pages 3-4.) This is incorrect. As described above, the driving member 42 and the controlling magnetic valve 82 are not mechanically connected to the pivotally connected base boards 1 and 2 as in Chung. On this basis alone, Claims 3-6 and 14-17 are not anticipated by Chung.

Obviousness

(b) The Rejection of Claims 8-11 and 19-22 Based on the Combination of Chung and Neathway Fails to State a Prima Facie Case of Obviousness.

The final rejection of Claims 8-11 and 19-22 is based on a combination of Chung and Neathway et al (U.S. Patent 6,227,343 B1). The Office Action references the Chung apparatus system, noting that Chung fails to disclose Hall effect sensors, photoelectric sensors, LED sensors and IR sensors, as described in Claim 8-11 and 19-22. (Office Action, Page 4). Citing Neathway, Col. 1, lines 58-64; Col. 2, lines 3-9; and Col. 4, lines 17-30, the Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ “Hall effect, photoelectric, LED or IR sensors in the coin raceway of Chung.” (Office Action, Page 4.)

The issue is whether the combination of references applied by the Office Action can be properly combined to make out a case of prima facie obviousness. *See, e.g., McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 1351, 60 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir.

2001). To combine references, there must exist some teaching, suggestion, reason or motivation to do so. *Id.*

Appellants submit that the final rejection fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that the sensors of Neathway are employed in the apparatus of Chung, as described above in connection with the asserted anticipation argument, the combination of Chung and Neathway would fail to arrive at the claimed invention. In Chung, the driving member 42 and controlling magnetic valve 82 are not in mechanical connection with the pivotally connected base boards 1 and 2. As noted above, base boards 1 and 2 are biased apart through actuation of a coin return lever 14. Coin detection and processor programming plays no part in the biasing apart of base boards 1 and 2 in Chung. The disclosure of Neathway does not alter the basic configuration of Chung and fails to disclose or suggest a reason to combine Chung and Neathway in order to do so. Accordingly, the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 8-11 and 19-22.

(c) The Rejection of Claims 12, 23, 29 and 30 Based on the Combination of Chung and Mercurio Fails to State a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness.

The final rejection of Claims 12 and 23 and Claims 29-30 are based on the combination of Chung and Mercurio (U.S. Patent 5,007,519). Appellants submit that the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Office Action states that Chung fails to disclose a light coin spring detector as in Claims 12, 23, 29 and 30. (Office Action, Page 5.) The Office Action indicates that Mercurio discloses a light coin spring detector 70 located in a downstream portion of a rejector body, referencing Mercurio, Col. 3, lines 48-68 and Col. 4, lines 1-4. The Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a light coin spring detector in the downstream passageway of the Chung apparatus. (Office Action, Page 5). The Office Action indicates that the suggestion or motivation to do so would be “to provide a further layer of security in insure correctly weighted coins are allowed to pass through to the coin box,” referring to the last seven lines of Mercurio’s abstract. (Office Action, Page 5.)

The apparatus of Chung operates differently from the presently claimed invention as discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejection. Even assuming a combination of Chung and Mercurio, the resulting combination would fail to arrive at the presently claimed invention, and neither Chung nor Mercurio contain any suggestion or motivation that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to change or alter the basic operation of Chung. Moreover, the mechanism of Mercurio is fundamentally different than the mechanism of the present invention. Mercurio incorporates an adjustable weighting means 86 that allows the coin to proceed in a generally horizontal direction to a rejection means (Col. 4, lines 1-8). Coins of proper weight will be deflected by the adjustable weighting means 87 and allow a properly weighted coin to drop downwardly between plates 30 and 31 into a coin collection box, where horizontal movement is arrested by a stop washer 54 (Col. 3, lines 61-68; Col. 4, lines 1-4). Unlike Mercurio, the present invention employs light coin stop springs to stop underweight coins, thereby triggering the rejector body to open, allowing the underweight coin to fall from the rejector body. Accordingly, Mercurio would have failed to suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to stop underweight coins in a coin race. Accordingly, Mercurio fails to contain any suggestion or motivation to modify Chung to arrive at the presently claimed invention and therefore fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

(d) The Rejection of Claims 31 and 33 Based on the Combination of Chung and Fougere Fails to State a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness

The final rejection of Claims 31 and 32 are based on a combination of Chung and Fougere (U.S. Patent 3,792,766). The Office Action indicates that Chung fails to disclose a magnet mounted adjacent the coin race in the upstream portion of the separator and rejector body as claimed in Claims 31 and 32. The Office Action indicates that Fougere discloses a magnet, concluding that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a movable magnet in the downstream passageway of the rejector body of Chung. (Office Action, Page 6.) The Office Action indicates that the motivation or suggestion for doing so would be to add a further layer of security “to insure that coins having ‘a magnetic permeability to density ratio in excess of

a predetermined value' are eliminated from the raceway," citing the abstract of Fougere. (Office Action, Page 6.)

As discussed above, the device of Chung operates differently from the presently claimed invention. Although the use of a magnet to remove coins from a raceway is described in Fougere, there is no motivation or suggestion contained in either Chung or Fougere to modify the device of Chung in such a way as to arrive at the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, the Office Action fails to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

(e) The Rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 Based Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over Bruner (U.S. Patent 5,988,349) Claims 1-22 of in View of Chung is Unwarranted.

The final rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action indicates that the claims are unpatentable over Claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent 5,988,349 in view of Chung. (Office Action, Page 7.) Appellants submit that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is unwarranted.

The legal standard for an obviousness-type double patenting rejection is whether the claim in the application defines an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. MPEP 804IIB1 states that a double patenting rejection of the obvious-type is "analogous to [a failure to meet] the nonobviousness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 103 except that the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art. *In re Braithwaite*, 379 F.2d 594, 154 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1967). Therefore, any analysis employed in an obvious-type double patenting rejection parallels the guidelines for analysis of a 35 U.S.C. § 103 obviousness determination. *In re Braat*, 937 F.2d 589, 19 USPQ2d 1289 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985)

The Office Action indicates that “[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both describe a coin separator and rejector body having one or more sensors located upstream (sic, upstream) and downstream of said rejector body, the system controlled by a processor.” Office Action, Page 7. This is incorrect. The ‘349 patent fails to contain any disclosure or claims relating to the use of sensors or actuators for sensing and removing jammed coins. Nor does Chung disclose the use of sensors or actuators to removed jammed coins from a coin race as described in the presently claimed invention. The Office Action fails to provide any further substantiation for concluding that the claims of the presently claimed invention are merely obvious variations of the claims of the ‘349 patent. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 over the Claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 5,988,349 should be reversed on the merits because the instant claims are not merely an obvious variation of the claims in the ‘349 Patent.

(f) The Rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 Based Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over Bruner (U.S. Patent 6,155,399) Claims 1-25 in View Chung is Unwarranted.

The final rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action indicates that the claims are unpatentable over Claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent 6,155,399 in view of Chung. (Office Action, Page 7.) Appellants submit that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is unwarranted.

The final rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action indicates that “[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the both describe a coin separator and rejector body having one or more sensors located upstream (sic, upstream) and downstream of said rejector body, the system controlled by a processor.” (Office Action, Page 7). This is incorrect. The ‘399 patent fails to contain any disclosure or claims relating to the use of sensors or actuators for sensing and removing jammed coins. Nor does Chung disclose the use of sensors or

actuators to removed jammed coins from a coin race as described in the presently claimed invention. The Office Action fails to provide any further substantiation for concluding that the claims of the presently claimed invention are merely obvious variations of the claims of the '399 patent. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 over the Claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,399 should be reversed on the merits because the instant claims are not merely an obvious variation of the claims in the '399 Patent.

(g) The Rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 Based Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Over Bruner (U.S. Patent 5,647,470) Claim 1 in View Chung is Unwarranted.

The final rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action indicates that the claims are unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. Patent 5,647,470 in view of Chung. (Office Action, Page 8.) Appellants submit that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is unwarranted.

The Office Action indicates that “[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the both describe a coin separator and rejector body having one or more sensors located upstream (sic, upstream) and downstream of said rejector body, the system controlled by a processor.” (Office Action, Page 8. This is incorrect.) The '470 patent fails to contain any disclosure or claim relating to the use of sensors or actuators for sensing and removing jammed coins. Nor does Chung disclose the use of sensors or actuators to removed jammed coins from a coin race as described in the presently claimed invention. The Office Action fails to provide any further substantiation for concluding that the claims of the presently claimed invention are merely obvious variations of Claim 1 of the '470 patent. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 over Claims 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,647,470 should be reversed on the merits because the instant claims are not merely an obvious variation of the claim in the '470 Patent.

**(h) The Provisional Rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 Based
Obviousness-Type Double Patenting in View Co-Pending Application
Serial No. 09/339,011 in View of Chung is Moot.**

The final rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is based on the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Office Action indicates that the claims are unpatentable over co-pending Application 09/339,011 in view of Chung. Application Serial no. 09/339,011 has been abandoned. Accordingly, this provisional rejection has been rendered moot.

(9) Appendix

An Appendix A containing a copy of the claims involved in the appeal is attached herewith.

(10) Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-23 and 27-34 is erroneous. The Honorable Board is respectfully requested to reverse the Examiner's rejection of all claims on appeal and remand the application to the Examiner for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

Date: October 13, 2005


Glenn W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 31,790)
Constance F. Ramos (Reg. No. 47,883)
Howrey LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive
Suites 200 & 300
Falls Church, VA 22042
Phone: 703.663.3600
Fax: 703.336.6950



Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record..
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

Appendix A

1. A coin separator and rejector apparatus, comprising:
 - (a) a coin separator and rejector body having two or more segments hinged together in pivotal connection, said pivotally connected segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged segments defining one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed between said hinged segments, said rejector body having an upstream portion and a downstream portion, and said coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall, at least a portion of one of said walls in pivotal connection with at least one of said hinged segments of said coin separator and rejector body;
 - (b) one or more sensors located in said upstream portion of said rejector body;
 - (c) an actuator in mechanical connection with said pivotal portion of said race wall; and
 - (d) a programmed processor in electrical communication with said one or more sensors and with said actuator whereby, in accordance with the programming of said processor, said actuator will pivot said pivotal portion of said race wall from said closed position to said open position upon detection of a coin by said one or more sensors.
2. The apparatus of Claim 1 further comprising a second sensor located in said downstream portion of said rejector body.
3. The apparatus of Claim 1 wherein said actuator is an electric motor.
4. The apparatus of Claim 1 wherein said actuator is a solenoid.
5. The apparatus of Claim 4 wherein said solenoid is a latching solenoid.
6. The apparatus of Claim 4 wherein said solenoid is a wound cap solenoid.
7. The apparatus of Claim 1 wherein at least one of said sensors is an induction coil.
8. The apparatus of Claim 1 wherein at least one of said sensors is a Hall effect sensor.
9. The apparatus of Claim 1 wherein at least one of said sensors is a photoelectric sensor.

10. The apparatus of Claim 9 wherein at least one of said sensors is an LED sensor.
11. The apparatus of Claim 9 wherein at least one of said sensors is an IR sensor.
12. The apparatus of Claim 1 further comprising a light coin spring detector positioned in the downstream portion of said rejector body.
13. A coin separator and rejector apparatus, comprising:
 - (a) a coin separator and rejector body having two or more segments hinged together in pivotal connection, said hinged segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged segments defining one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed between said hinged segments, said rejector body having an upstream portion and a downstream portion, said coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall, at least a portion of one of said walls in pivotal connection with at least one of said hinged segments of said coin separator and rejector body;
 - (b) one or more sensors located in said upstream portion of said rejector body;
 - (c) one or more sensors located in said downstream portion of said rejector body.
 - (d) an actuator in mechanical connection with said pivotal portion of said race wall; and
 - (e) a programmed processor in electrical communication with said sensors and with said actuator whereby, in accordance with the programming of said processor, said actuator will pivot said pivotal portion of said race wall from said closed position to said open position upon detection of a coin by said sensors.
14. The apparatus of Claim 13 wherein said actuator is an electric motor.
15. The apparatus of Claim 13 wherein said actuator is a solenoid.
16. The apparatus of Claim 15 wherein said solenoid is a latching solenoid.
17. The apparatus of Claim 15 wherein said solenoid is a wound cap solenoid.
18. The apparatus of Claim 13 wherein at least one of said sensors is an induction coil.

19. The apparatus of Claim 13 wherein at least one of said sensors is a Hall effect sensor.
20. The apparatus of Claim 13 wherein at least one of said sensors is a photoelectric sensor.
21. The apparatus of Claim 20 wherein at least one of said sensors is an LED sensor.
22. The apparatus of Claim 20 wherein at least one of said sensors is an IR sensor.
23. The apparatus of Claim 13 further comprising a light coin spring detector positioned between said one or more sensors located in said upstream portion of said rejector body and said one or more sensors located in said downstream portion of said rejector body.
24. A method of rejecting jammed coins from a coin separator and rejector, comprising
 - (a) programming a processor with a pre-selected minimum transit time and a pre-selected maximum transit time for a coin to transit a coin sensor located in a coin path in a coin separator and rejector;
 - (b) sensing the transit time of a coin transiting a coin sensor located in a coin path of a coin separator and rejector;
 - (c) sending a signal from said sensor to said processor;
 - (d) calculating the transit time of said coin transiting said coin sensor;
 - (e) comparing the transit time to said pre-selected minimum and maximum transit times; and
 - (f) sending a signal from said processor to a coin rejection actuator if said coin transit time fails to fall within said pre-selected transit times.
25. A method of rejecting jammed coins from a coin separator and rejector, comprising
 - (a) establishing an electronic signature for a coin with a sensor;
 - (b) storing said electronic signature in a processor;
 - (c) sensing a coin with a sensor located in a coin path in a coin separator and rejector;
 - (d) sending a signal from said sensor to said processor;

- (e) comparing said signal from said sensor with said electronic signature stored in said processor; and
- (f) sending a signal from said processor to a coin rejection actuator if said signal fails to match said electronic signature.

26. A method of rejecting jammed coins from a coin separator and rejector, comprising:

- (a) detecting a coin in an upstream portion of a coin separator and rejector with a first sensor and sending a signal to a processor;
- (b) waiting a predetermined time period for the detection of a signal by said processor from a second sensor positioned in a downstream portion of said coin separator and rejector; and
- (c) sending a signal from said processor to a coin rejection actuator in the absence of a signal from said second sensor after said predetermined time period.

27. An apparatus for accepting and rejecting coins, comprising:

- (a) a coin separator and rejector body having an upstream portion and a downstream portion, said coin separator and rejector body formed from two or more segments hinged together, said hinged together segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged together segments forming one or more downwardly inclined coin races between said hinged segments, said coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall, at least a portion of one of said walls in pivotal connection with said hinged segment of said coin acceptor and rejector body;
- (b) means for sensing located in said upstream portion of said coin separator and rejector body;
- (c) means for pivoting from a closed position to an open position at least one of said hinged segments in pivotal connection with at least a portion of one of said walls; and
- (d) a processor in electrical communication with said sensing means and said pivoting means whereby, in accordance with the programming of said

processor, said pivoting means will pivot said pivotal portion of said race wall from said closed position to said open position upon detection of a coin by said sensing means.

28. The apparatus of Claim 27 further comprising means for sensing located in said downstream portion of said coin separator and rejector body.
29. The apparatus of Claim 27 further comprising means for stopping a coin of insufficient weight in said coin race, said means located downstream of said sensing means.
30. The apparatus of Claim 27 further comprising means for stopping a coin of less than a predetermined weight, said means located between said sensing means located in said upstream portion of said coin separator and rejector body and said downstream portion of said coin separator and rejector body.
31. The apparatus of Claim 27 further comprising a magnet mounted adjacent said coin race in the upstream portion of said coin separator and rejector body.
32. A coin acceptor and rejector apparatus, comprising:
 - (a) A coin acceptor and rejector body comprising two or more segments hinged together, said hinged together segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged together segments further comprising one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed therein, said downwardly inclined coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall wherein at least a portion of one of said race walls is in pivotal connection with said acceptor and rejector body, said pivotal connection having an open position and a closed position wherein in said open position an object contained in said coin race will be released from said acceptor and rejector body; said acceptor and rejector body further comprising an upstream portion and a downstream portion;
 - (b) A first sensor located in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said first sensor adapted for detecting an object in said coin race in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;

- (c) A second sensor located in said downstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said second sensor adapted for detecting an object in said coin race in said downstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;
- (d) An actuator in mechanical connection with said pivotal portion of said race wall for pivoting said pivotal connection from said closed position to said open position;
- (e) A processor in electrical communication with said first sensor, said second sensor and said actuator, said processor programmed to receive a signal from said second sensor within a predetermined time period upon detection of an object by said first sensor in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said processor further programmed to send a signal to said actuator to pivot said pivotal connection from said closed position to said open position if said predetermined time period is exceeded.

33. A coin acceptor and rejector apparatus, comprising:

- (a) A coin acceptor and rejector body comprising two or more segments hinged together, said hinged together segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged together segments further comprising one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed therein, one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed within said acceptor and rejector body, said downwardly inclined coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall wherein at least a portion of one of said race walls is in pivotal connection with said acceptor and rejector body, said pivotal connection having an open position and a closed position wherein in said open position an object contained in said coin race will be released from said acceptor and rejector body; said acceptor and rejector body further comprising an upstream portion and a downstream portion;
- (b) A magnet mounted adjacent said coin race located in said upstream portion of the said acceptor and rejector body, said magnet adapted to

swing away upon pivoting said pivotal connection from said closed position to said open position;

- (c) A first sensor located in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said first sensor adapted for detecting an object in said coin race in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;
- (d) A second sensor located in said downstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said second sensor adapted for detecting an object in said coin race in said downstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;
- (e) An actuator in mechanical connection with said pivotal portion of said race wall for pivoting said pivotal connection from said closed position to said open position;
- (f) A processor in electrical communication with said first sensor, said second sensor and said actuator, said processor programmed to receive a signal from said second sensor within a predetermined time period upon detection of an object by said first sensor in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body, said processor further programmed to send a signal to said actuator to pivot said pivotal connection from said closed position to said open position if said predetermined time period is exceeded.

34. A coin acceptor and rejector apparatus, comprising:

- (a) a coin acceptor and rejector body comprising two or more segments hinged together, said hinged together segments adapted to pivot around said hinge from a closed position to an open position, said hinged together segments further comprising one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed therein, one or more downwardly inclined coin races formed within said acceptor and rejector body, said downwardly inclined coin races further comprising a first wall and a second wall wherein at least a portion of one of said race walls is in pivotal connection with said acceptor and rejector body, said pivotal connection having an open position and a closed position wherein in said open position an object contained in said coin race will be released from said acceptor and rejector body; said

acceptor and rejector body further comprising an upstream portion and a downstream portion;

- (b) Means for detecting an object in said coin race by a first sensor located in said upstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;
- (c) Means for detecting an object in said coin race by a second sensor located in said downstream portion of said acceptor and rejector body;
- (d) Means for pivoting a portion of said race wall from said closed position to said open position;
- (e) Means for signaling said pivotal portion of said race wall to move from said closed position to said open position if a predetermined time period is exceeded in detecting an object in said coin race by said first sensor and detecting an object in said coin race by said second sensor.

OCT 13 2005

Effective on 12/08/2004.

Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

Fee Transmittal

for FY 2005

 Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$1,045.00)

Complete If Known

Application Number	09/497,284
Filing Date	February 2, 2000
First Named Inventor	Philemon L. Bruner
Examiner Name	Jeffrey A. Shapiro
Art Unit	3653
Attorney Docket No.	10356.0035.NPUS00

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

 Check Credit Card Money Order None Other (please identify): _____

 Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 08-3038 Deposit Account Name: Howrey

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

 Charge fee(s) indicated below Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee
 Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17 Credit any overpayments

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

FEE CALCULATION

1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES

Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES	
	Fee (\$)	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	Small Entity
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0

2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES

Fee Description

Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)

Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)

Multiple dependent claims

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fees Paid (\$)	Small Entity	Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)
- 20 or HP =	x	=		50	25	

HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20

Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fees Paid (\$)	Multiple Dependent Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
- 3 or HP =	x	=		200	100	

HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3

3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
- 100 =	/50 =	(round up to a whole number) x	=	Fee Paid (\$)

4. OTHER FEE(S)


Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)

Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): Appeal Brief; Extension of time within fourth month

1,045.00

SUBMITTED BY

Signature


Registration No. 31,970/47,883
(Attorney/Agent)

Telephone (415) 848-3226

Name (Print/Type) Glenn W. Rhodes/Constance F. Ramos

Date October 13, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.